

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAR 21 2023

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

TATYANA EVGENIEVNA DREVALEVA,

No. 22-15547

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 3:16-cv-07414-LB

v.

MEMORANDUM*

ALAMEDA HEALTH SYSTEM;
DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL
RELATIONS, Division of Labor Standards
Enforcement; CATHERINE DALY; JOAN
HEALY; BOBBIT SANTOS; ERIC ROOD,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of California
Laurel D. Beeler, Magistrate Judge, Presiding**

Submitted March 14, 2023***

Before: SILVERMAN, SUNG, and SANCHEZ, Circuit Judges.

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** The parties consented to proceed before a magistrate judge. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(c).

*** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Tatyana Evgenievna Drevaleva appeals pro se from the district court's post-judgment orders denying her motions for relief from judgment in her employment action. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for an abuse of discretion. *Garamendi v. Henin*, 683 F.3d 1069, 1077 (9th Cir. 2012) (Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(a)); *Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah County, Or. v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1262 (9th Cir. 1993) (Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)); *United States v. Sierra Pac. Indus., Inc.*, 862 F.3d 1157, 1166 (9th Cir. 2017) (Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(d)(3)). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Drevaleva's post-judgment motions because Drevaleva failed to demonstrate any basis for relief. *See Sch. Dist. No. 1J*, 5 F.3d at 1262-63 (grounds for relief under Rule 60(b)); *see also Sierra Pac.*, 862 F.3d at 1167-68 (grounds for relief under Rule 60(d)(3)); *Garamendi*, 683 F.3d at 1077-80 (9th Cir. 2012) (factors warranting relief under Rule 60(a)).

All pending motions are denied as moot.

AFFIRMED.